Middle Level Best Practice and Student Achievement in Texas

Dawn Michelle Williams Stephen F. Austin State University

The purpose of this study was to determine the implementation level of best practice strategies for middle level education in the state of Texas described by This We Believe (AMLE, 2010) and to determine the relationship of those practices with the schools' academic achievement in math and reading. A survey was distributed to principals of all intermediate, middle schools, and junior highs in the state of Texas to determine what middle school practices are actually implemented. Additionally an OLS regression was utilized to determine the relationship of middle level best practice to student achievement in math and reading. Varied rates of implementation were reported and the number of students living in poverty was determined to be the most significant relationship, a negative one, with student achievement. Parental involvement was shown to have a moderate positive relationship with student achievement in both reading and math.

Breaking Ranks in the Middle (NASSP, 1996), Turning Points (Jackson & Davis, 2000), and This We Believe (AMLE, 2010) all support the middle school movement which recognizes the importance of appropriate education for early adolescents based on their unique needs and includes comprehensive recommendations for the education and development of middle school students. Turning Points (Carnegie, 1989) described the mismatch between the structure of schools and the intellectual and emotional needs of the early adolescent learner. This We Believe (AMLE, 2010) has long provided the framework that guides middle level education and acknowledged that successful middle schools are developmentally responsive, challenging, empowering, and equitable. This important document clearly described the 16 essential characteristics or practices of successful middle level schools.

Unfortunately, with budget restraints, school administrators are forced to make tough decisions to reduce costs, which often results in the elimination of programs (Protheroe, 2011). Therefore, it is not clear how many middle schools actually implement the best practices described in *This We Believe*. A few studies have been conducted concerning the implementation of middle level best practice and its impact on student achievement (Mertens, Flowers, & Mulhall, 1998; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). However, at this time there is a critical need to explore the level of implementation of middle level practices in Texas schools and to determine what relationship exists between best practice and school performance as measured by the percentage of students passing state reading and math tests. This is so because proposed changes in teacher certification at the state level threaten middle level certification in Texas. Currently, Texas teachers are certified EC-6, 4-

8, or 7-12. The definition of highly qualified teachers for middle level students has changed with candidates often required to take both a generalist and specialist exam to be considered highly qualified to meet No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) standards. Some universities no longer offer teacher education programs that specialized in middle level education. The purpose of this study was to determine the implementation level of best practice strategies for middle level education described in *This We Believe* (AMLE, 2010) in the state of Texas and to determine the relationship of those practices with the schools' academic achievement in math and reading. This research sought to answer two questions:

- 1. To what extent does This We Believe outline key middle level practices implemented in the State of Texas?
- 2. What (if any) is the relationship of these practices to the schools' academic achievement in reading and math?

Implementation of Middle Level Best Practice

This We Believe (TWB) (AMLE, 2010) identified four essential attributes and sixteen key characteristics that are essential for middle level schools to be effective. Successful middle schools must be developmentally responsive, challenging, empowering, and equitable. TWB outlined 16 characteristics of effective middle schools divided between three categories which include (a) curriculum, instruction, and assessment, (b) leadership and organization, and (c) culture and community. The 16 characteristics are listed below.

•Educators value young adolescents and are prepared to teach them.

- Students and teachers are engaged in active, purposeful learning.
- Curriculum is challenging, exploratory, integrative, and relevant
- Educators use multiple learning and teaching approaches.
- Varied and ongoing assessments advance learning as well as measure it.
- A shared vision developed by all stakeholders guides every decision.
- Leaders are committed to and knowledgeable about this age group, educational research, and best practices.
- Leaders demonstrate courage and collaboration.
- Ongoing professional development reflects best educational practices.
- Organizational structures foster purposeful learning and meaningful relationships.
- The school environment is inviting, safe, inclusive, and supportive of all.
- An adult advocate guides every student's academic and personal development.
- Comprehensive guidance and supportive services meet the needs of young adolescents.
- Health and wellness are supported in curricula, school-wide programs, and related policies.
- The school actively involves families in the education of their children.
- The school includes community and business partners.

(AMLE, 2010, p.14)

McEwin and Greene (2011) reported on two national studies summarizing the status of middle level schools. The first study included a random survey of 827 middle schools across the country. The schools varied in size and demographics. The survey included information concerning the implementation of interdisciplinary teaming, common plan time, schedules, curriculum, electives, sports, advisory, instructional strategies, technology, and teacher preparation. The results of the study revealed a strong support in middle level best practice with a noted gap between acknowledging support and the actual implementation of the middle level practice.

The other study focused on 101 schools that were consider highly successful and recognized as either Schools to Watch, sponsored by the National Forum for Middle Grades Reform, or as Breakthrough Middle Schools, recognized by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (McEwin & Greene, 2011). A higher level of implementation was noted in these schools. Additionally, the percentages of students who scored on or above grade average in math and reading were greater in these schools. Schools recognized as highly successful were more likely to utilize interdisciplinary teaming, common plan time, flexible scheduling, varied instruction, and advisory programs. They were also more likely to have teachers who were specially trained to work with students at this age level. Meeks and Stepka (2004) compared the level of implementation of middle level practice in Arkansas in 1990 to the implementation rate in 2004. Overall, implementation levels increased slightly with the support of a statewide center supporting middle level concept and best practice.

This research examined 12 specific middle level practices that have been noted as important to the success of middle level students. First of all, it is important that middle level teachers have a thorough understanding of young adolescents and middle level

concept. Research indicates that teachers who are specially trained in middle level best practices are more likely to implement effective teaching practices (Flowers, Mertens, & Mulhall, 1999; Mertens, Flowers, & Mulhall, 2002). Likewise, middle level teachers should be involved in high quality staff development to enhance best practices and support middle level concept (Mertens & Flowers, 2004).

Another important practice in successful middle level schools is the implementation of advisory programs. While researchers acknowledge the difficulty of implementing successful advisory programs, the importance of advisory to middle concept is universal. Advisory programs have shown to be successful in increased self-esteem for students, improved interpersonal relationships, and an overall positive school climate (Conners, 1991; Mac Iver, 1990; Ziegler & Mulhall, 1994). Additionally, schedules are an important organizational structure in middle level schools. Flexible block schedules with extended amount of class time results in increased collaboration in the classroom and the implementation of more varied instructional strategies (Brown, 2001; McLeod, 2005; Seed, 1998).

Interdisciplinary teaming is important to the success of middle level schools. Felner, Jackson, Kasak, Mulhall, Brand, & Flowers (1997) noted greater academic achievement and overall higher self-esteem among students in schools that implement interdisciplinary teams. Mertens, Flowers, and Mulhall (1998) reported improved achievement for students of poverty in schools that implemented this practice. Also important is providing time for those teams to work together in a common conference or planning period. Flowers et al. (1999) recommended teams meet a minimum of four times per week for thirty minutes.

Effective middle schools place students together heterogeneously rather than tracking or ability grouping them. Research has linked heterogeneous grouping to academic achievement, increased self-esteem, and improved interpersonal relationships (Slavin, 1990; Villa & Thousand, 2003). In addition to heterogeneous grouping, there is evidence that varied instructional strategies based on learning styles, interests, talents, and skills positively impacts student achievement (Beecher & Sweeny, 2008; Brighton, 2007).

Similarly, it is important for teachers to implement varied formative and summative assessment to assess student learning and make instructional decisions (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2008; Heritage, 2007). Heritage referred to formative assessment as a tool to inform instruction and provide important information concerning student progress. *This We Believe* (2010) promoted a number of best practices or strategies for middle level students including integrated curriculum, intramural sports, clubs, exploratory classes, health programs, council services, etc. This also included interventions for students who struggle academically.

Finally, the importance of parental involvement in the middle level grades has been recognized as important to students' academic success (Fan & Chen; 2001; Mo & Singh, 2008). Snow, Porche, Tabors, and Harris (2007) acknowledged the importance of parents and students working together to support students academically.

Middle Level Practice and Student Achievement

Turning Points (Carnegie, 1989) recommended comprehensive middle school reform based on student achievement, socio-emotional development, and behavior adjustment. Felner, et.al. (1997) evaluated the impact of the implementation of those recommendations and found that high implementation of the recom-

mendations resulted in higher achievement scores. Another study by Mertens et al. (1998) compared the achievement of Middle Start "grant" schools with "non-grant" schools. schools that were engaged in funding, professional development, on-site support, and networking to support middle level practice outperformed the schools that were not involved in the reform. Backes, Ralson, and Ingwalson (1999) implemented a similar study in North Dakota with similar results. Additionally, Mertens and Flowers (2006) compared the achievement of schools involved in a regional middle school reform initiative with a control group of schools and found that those with high level of implementation demonstrated higher levels of academic achievement. A more recent study compared "Schools to Watch" schools in Kentucky to other schools without that recognition (Cook, Faulkner, & Kinne, 2009). Results indicated a higher implementation of middle level best practices in the "Schools to Watch" schools but not overall higher test scores. Most of these studies were experimental in design comparing schools recognized as highly successful with those that were not.

Method

Participants

Ninety-five intermediate, middle, and junior high principals completed a survey to determine what middle level best practices were implemented in their respective schools. The first fifteen questions of the survey were related to grade configuration, accountability ratings, demographics, and size of the school. The grade configuration of the schools varied and is illustrated in Table 1. Ninety-two (96 %) of the principals reported their school's accountability rating as acceptable, and six rated as them unacceptable. Forty-nine schools (52 %) reported that their school was listed as acceptable with distinctions in one or more areas. Schools varied in diversity from nine percent minority to 99 % minority (non-white). Poverty rates varied from zero to 93 %. Of the schools reporting, the average percentage of minority students was 54.8, and the average percentage of student of low socio-economic status was 58.5. The number of students in the school ranged from 25 to 1676 with a mean of 606. While the survey's completion rate was relatively small, there appeared to be a wide variety of schools represented in the data as shown in Table 1.

Table 1School Configuration of participating schools

Grade Configuration	Number
Grades 6-8	50
Grades 7-8	11
Grades 5-8	5
Grades 5-6	5
Grades 4-5	3
Grades 3-5	3
PK-12	8
Grades 6-12	2
PK-8	2
Grades 4-6	1
Grades 7-12	1
Grades K-12	1
Grade 6	1
No Response	1

Procedures

A survey was sent to building principals in all (1779) Texas middle level schools (intermediate, middle, and junior high) via Qualtrics, an online survey system in September of 2013. The survey remained open through December of that year with a reminder email sent mid-semester. The survey consisted of 29 questions to determine which best practices were implemented in the respondents' schools. The survey included questions concerning the implementation of the following best practices: teaming, common plan time, advisory, exploratory classes, intramural sports, service learning, interdisciplinary instruction, team teaching, looping, multi-age grouping, scheduling (flexible, block, or traditional), and parent/community involvement. The survey is included as an appendix.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the level of implementation across the respondents, and the OLS regression model was utilized to determine the relationship of middle level practices to middle level schools' level of academic achievement in math and reading. To determine the implementation rate, each school's responses were examined and the best practices totaled and entered as a numerical score (0-14). The survey asked the respondent to respond with the name of the school in order to determine the average test scores. Data were retrieved from Texas Education Agency's accountability system to determine the percent of students passing the math and reading portions of the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). These data were analyzed using The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2013) to determine the relationship between the middle level practices to the school's students passing the math and reading State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) tests. Descriptive statistics were used to report the number of middle level schools in Texas implementing specific best practices described in This We Believe (AMLE, 2010). The percentage of implementation was calculated and appears below.

An OLS regression analysis was used to determine whether a relationship exists between variables, to describe the nature of the relationship if one exists, and to assess the importance of the predictor variables in their contribution to the variation in the dependent variable (Thompson, 2006). The total number of middle level best practices reported by the respondents (total) was the independent variable with reading and math STAAR averages as the dependent variables while controlling for race and socioeconomic status. Thirteen key items were coded yes or no and totaled to come up with a total best practice number. The mean score for the total best practices was 6.78. Those items were (a) teachers trained in middle level grades, (b) staff development specifically for middle level, (c) advisory that meets at least once per week, (d) flexible block scheduling, (e) interdisciplinary teams, (f) individual and common plan time, (g) teams meet at least once per week, (h) heterogeneous grouping, (i) varied instructional strategies (less than 40% direct instruction), (j) authentic assessments, (k) number of student services, (l) parental involvement, and (m) number of remedial services or interventions for students. Dependent variables were the percentage of students who passed the math and reading STAAR exams. The best practice total, race, and socio-economic data were also entered into SPSS to determine which of the independent variables most closely correlate to the schools' accountability ratings. In order to determine the robustness of the regression model, regression diagnostics were conducted. These diagnostics include an examination of the residual plots, consideration of the Pearson's correlation matrix of all variables, and analysis of the variable inflation factors (VIF).

Findings Implementation of Best Practices

Respondents were asked to respond to a series of 14 questions to determine what key middle level practices were implemented in their schools. Questions were based upon the attributes described in This We Believe (AMLE, 2010). The first question had to do with teachers trained specifically in working with young adolescents. Fifty-eight percent of the principals reported that 76% or more of their teachers were specifically trained in middle level grades. That number appeared to be too high, and it is likely that the principals reported teachers certified to teach at that level, but not necessarily specifically trained in that area as teachers in middle level in Texas may be licensed to teach EC-6, 4-7, or 7-12 grades. Additionally, 79 % of the principals reported staff development related to meeting the needs of young adolescents. The questions that followed were related to specific practices noted as best practice in the middle school. The best practices that were most commonly reported were advisories, heterogeneous grouping, varied instruction, project based assessments, clubs, and parental involvement. Important middle level practices that were less common were flexible sched-

uling, interdisciplinary teaming, common plan times, team meetings, intramural sports, and exploratory classes. Most schools reported remedial services such as tutorials, after school programs, special education, etc. The implementation level of middle level best practice is illustrated in Table 2.

Best Practice and Student Achievement

The results did not show any significant relationship between academic achievement and total best practices. However, there was a strong negative relationship (-.343 reading and -.384 math) between student achievement and the percent of low socio-economic students in the school. Additionally, an OLS regression was conducted with each of the 13 best practices while controlling for poverty. The results indicated a moderate positive relationship between parent involvement and student achievement both in math (.249) and reading (.246). There was also a moderate relationship between the number of remedial interventions provided and student achievement in reading and math (.203 in math and .227 in reading). Again, the strongest relationship was a negative relationship between poverty and academic achievement in both reading and math. Table 3 illustrates the results of the OLS regression for math, and Table 4 illustrates the results for reading.

Discussion

The results of OLG regression did not show any significant relationship between the total number of best practices and students' achievement in math and reading. There was also no significant relationship between most of the individual best practices and student achievement. While the survey return rate was small and there was no significant relationship found between students' academic achievement and middle level best practices, two important relationships were established. The first was the relationship between poverty and student achievement. Schools with high numbers of students living in poverty had lower numbers of students passing both reading and math exams. The effect of poverty on student achievement is not surprising. Cavanagh (2007) reported that test scores in the United States are more affected by poverty than those reported from any other country. The scores of students in the United States showed an 18 % variation

Table 2
Implementation of Middle Level Practice

Practice	Number	Percentage
50% or more specific preparation	70	74%
50% or more staff development	84	89%
Advisory	50	53 %
Flexible or A/B Block Schedules	20	21 %
Interdisciplinary Teams (or combination)	37	39%
Individual and Team Conference	27	28%
At least Weekly Team Meetings	33 of 37	89 %
(If reported interdisciplinary teams)		
Heterogeneous Grouping	61	64%
Varied Instructional Strategies	78	82%
Portfolio Assessment	19	20.4%
Project-based Assessments	62	65.6 %
Rubrics	71	77.4 %
Open ended/Essays	53	57. %
Integrated Curriculum	50	51.6 %
Intramural Sports	22	21.6 %
Clubs	82	86%
Exploratory Classes	24	24.7 %
Health Classes	52	57%
Tutorials	87	92.5 %
Counseling Services	79	81.7 %
Social Skills Training	49	51.6 %
Student Government	72	69.9 %
PT Conferences	92	93.5 %
Volunteers	66	68.8 %
Parent Nights	63	66.7 %
Parent Programs	52	54.8 %

Table 3Regression Analysis Coefficients for Math

Independent variable	Independent Beta	Poverty Beta	Adjusted R Squared
Total Number of Best Practice	.101	367**	.122**
Specially Trained	024	365**	.113**
Staff Development	.095	367**	.121**
Advisory	.009	365**	.112**
Flexible/Block Scheduling	.026	365**	.113**
Interdisciplinary Teaming	.155	376**	.136**
Common and Individual Plan Times	088	378**	.120**
At Least Weekly Team Meetings	.145	369**	.134**
Heterogeneous Grouping	039	361**	.114**
Varied Instructional Activities	145	375**	.134**
Authentic Assessment	.067	372**	.117**
Student Services/Activities	.110	370**	.125**
Parent Involvement	.249*	346**	.175**
Remedial Services	.203*	362**	.154**

Significance level

*.005 or less

**.001 or less

Table 4Regression Analysis Coefficients for Reading

Independent variable	Independent Beta	Poverty Beta	Adjusted R Squared
Total Number of Best Practices	.137	387**	.149**
Specially Trained	015	389**	.130**
Staff Development	.118	403**	.144**
Advisory	.036	387**	.131**
Flexible/Block Scheduling	.025	390**	.131**
Interdisciplinary Teaming	.122	390**	.145**
Common and Individual Plan Times	116	404**	.144**
Team Meetings at Least Weekly	.111	385**	.143**
Heterogeneous Grouping	.040	389**	.132**
Varied Instructional Activities	.075	394**	.136**
Authentic Assessment	.090	396**	.138**
Student Services/Activities	.123	389**	.146**
Parent Involvement	.246*	358**	.191**
Remedial Services	.227	392**	.183**

Significance level *.005 or less

**.001 or less

ondly, there was a significant relationship between student achievement in both reading and math for those schools with a high rate of parent involvement. This finding is consistent with that of Mo and Singh (2008) and Fan and Chen (2001). Additionally, a moderate positive relationship (.203 for math and .227 for reading) was indicated with the number of remedial services and student achievement. This may be attributed to the recent focus on the Response to Intervention process commonly utilized in schools (Bender & Shores, 2007). Multiple tiers of research inventions are systematically implemented based on individual student needs.

A number of studies have compared exemplary schools with high implementation of middle level best practice with those with little or no implementation and found that those with a high implementation rate outperformed the others academically demonstrating the importance of middle level philosophy to student success (Cook, Faulkner, & Kinne, 2009; Mertens & Flowers, 2006; Mertens et al., 1998; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). This research investigated the implementation level of middle level best practice and sought to determine the relationship of middle level best practice to student reading and math achievement on the STAAR. The data from this study did not demonstrate a signifi-

cant relationship between student achievement in reading, math, and middle level best practices. However, as Cook, Faulkner, and Vinne (2009) reported, "academic excellence – in this case measured by performance on a state assessment – is only one measure of a school's overall effectiveness" (p. 9).

Limitations and Recommendations

The survey in this research was a self-report that merely acknowledged implementation. It did not provide any detail about the level of implementation such as a description of the advisory program, details about how interdisciplinary team works at the school, etc. Additionally, the return rate was small, and therefore might contain response bias. Future research might include phone interviews in order to examine the practices in more detail and clarify terms for those unfamiliar with middle level practice. Providing some sort of incentive might also be helpful to encourage participation. It might be helpful to interview middle school administrators who attend the state middle school conference. Principals might be more willing to participate while away from school and in a face-to-face setting. Further research is needed to determine the long-term effects of middle level best practices on students' academic, social, and emotional development. A longitudinal study of middle schools across the state would be beneficial in determining the long-term effect of implementing middle level best practice. The longitudinal data should include other achievement data in addition to state assessments to determine the effect of middle level best practices on student achievement.

References

- AMLE (2010). This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.
- Backes, J., Ralson, A., & Ingwalson, G. (1999). Middle level reform: the impact on student achievement. Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly, 22(3), 43-57.
- Beecher, M., & Sweeny, S. (2008). Closing the achievement gap with curriculum enrichment and differentiation: One school's story. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 19(3), 502-530.
- Bender, W. F., & Shores, C.F. (2007). Response to intervention: A practical guide for every teacher. Boston: Sage.
- Brighton, K. (2007). Coming of age: The education and development of young adolescents. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association
- Brown, D.F. (2001). Middle level teachers' perceptions of the impact of block scheduling on instruction and learning. *Research in the Middle Grades Annual*, 24, 121-141.
- Carnegie (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century The report of the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Cavanagh, S. (2007, December 13). Poverty's effect on U.S. scores greater than for other nations. *Education Week*, 27(15) 1.
- Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2008). Finding balance: Assessment in the middle school classroom. *Middle Ground*, 12(2), 12-15.
- Conners, N. (1991). Teacher advisory: The fourth r. In J. L. Irvin (Ed.), *Transforming middle level education: Perspectives and possibilities* (pp. 162-178). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cook C.M., Faulkner, S.A., & Kinne, L.J. (2009). Indicators of middle school implementation: How do Kentucky's Schools to Watch measure up. Research in Middle Level Education, 32(6), 1-10.

- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students = academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 13(1), 1-22.
- Felner, R.D., Jackson, A.W., Kasak, D., Mulhall, P., Brand, S., & Flowers, N. (1997). The impact of school reform for the middle years: Longitudinal study of a network engaged in Turning Points-based comprehensive school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(7), 528-523, 541-550.
- Flowers, N., Mertens, S., & Mulhall, P. (1999). The impact of teaming: Five research-based outcomes of teaming. Middle School Journal, *31*(2), 57-60.
- Heritage, M. (2007). Teaching science in elementary and middle school: A project-based approach. New York: Rutledge.
- Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century. New York: Teacher College Press & National Middle School Association.
- Mac Iver, D. (1990). Meeting the needs of young adolescents: Advisory groups, interdisciplinary teaching teams, and school transition programs. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(6), 458-464.
- McEwin, K.C. & Greene, M.W. (2011). The status of programs and practices in America's middle schools: results from two national surveys. Westerville, OH: AMLE.
- McLeod, J. (2005). Kick-off, half time, and over-time: Flexible scheduling scores points. *Middle Ground*, 8(4), 12-13.
- Meeks, G.B., & Stepka, T. H. (2004). Statewide middle level implementation: Lesson learned. Research in Middle Level Education Online, 29(3), 1-17.
- Mertens, S.B., Flowers, N., & Mulhall, P. (1998). The middle start initiative phase I: A longitudinal analysis of Michigan middle-level schools. University of Illinois: Center for Prevention Research and Development.
- Mertens, S.B., Flowers, N., & Mulhall, P. (2002). The relationship between middle-grades teacher certification and teaching practices. In V.A. Anfara, Jr. & L Stacki (Eds.), *Middle School curriculum, instruction, and assessment* (pp. 119-138). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Mertens, S.B., & Flowers, N. (2004). Research summary: Professional development for teachers. From http://www.nmas.org/portals/0/pdf/research/Research_Summaries/Professional_Development.pdf
- Mertens, S.B., & Flowers, N. (2006) Middle Start's impact on comprehensive middle school reform. Middle Level Grades Research Journal, 1(1), 1-26.
- Mo, Y., & Singh, K. (2008). Parents' relationships and involvement: Effects on students' engagement and performance. Research in Middle Level Education Online, 31(10), 1-11.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (1996). Breaking ranks: Changing an American Institution, a report of the NASSP study of the restructuring of the American high school. NASSP Bulletin, 80(578), 55-66.
- NCLB (2002). Highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals. Paper presented at the Student Achievement and School Accountability Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Protheroe, N. (2011). Effective resource use: People, time and money. Principal's Research Review, 6(3), 1-7.
- Seed, A. (1998). Free at last: Making the most of the flexible block schedule. *Middle School Journal*, 29(5). 20-21.
- Slavin, R.E. (1990). Achievement effects of ability grouping in secondary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 60(3), 471-499.

Snow, C.E., Porche, M.V., Tabors, P.O., & Harris, S.R. (2007). Is literacy enough: Pathways to academic success for adolescents. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. R. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organization model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quaterly*, 36(5), 703–729.

Thompson, B. (2006). Foundations of behavioral statistics. New York: The Guilford Press.

Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (2003). Making inclusive education work. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 19-23.

Ziegler, S., & Mulhall, L. (1994). Establishing and evaluating a successful advisory program in a middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 25(4), 42-46.

Appendix

Middle Level Implementation Survey

Hello,

You are invited to participate in a survey concerning the implementation of middle level philosophy and practices in Texas. I am an assistant professor in the middle level grades preparation program at Stephen F. Austin State University. The survey examines what essential elements of middle level education are implemented and utilized in your school. Your participation will be greatly appreciated, and you will be sent a copy of the survey report if requested.

Potential benefits of this project will include a current analysis of the practices and progress of middle level education in Texas and the relationship of middle level practice and student achievement. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes of your time. Thank you for your participation.

Click on the link below to begin the survey.

Welcome to the Middle Level Implementation Survey!!! Please read the information below before beginning the survey.

- 1. PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY. You are being asked to participate in a research study designed to determine the implementation level of best practice strategies for middle level education described in *This We Believe* (AMLE, 2010) and determine the relationship of those practices with the schools' accountability rating status assigned by the Texas Education Agency
- 2. PROCEDURES. Please respond to the following survey questions. The survey should take about fifteen minutes for you to complete.
- 3. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Participation is strictly voluntary. You may discontinue participation at any time.
- 4. All records from this research will be confidential. In future publications your name and the name of your school will not be included. There are no risks involved in participating in this project.
- 5. If you have any concerns with this research, you may contact SFASU ORSP at 936-468-6606.

I give my consent to be a participant in this research project

Yes No

Please verify: I am a principal or assistant principal of a school which includes students in grades 4 through 8. (Grade configurations may vary, but it is important that your school include at least one of these grade levels). If your answer is no, do not continue. Please feel free to forward the survey to the appropriate person in your district.

Yes	No		
School Nar	ne (type in)		
Role: Princ	inal Assistant Principal	Other:	

Latest Accountability Rating: Acceptable Not Acceptable
Distinctions: Yes or No
List Distinctions:
What is the grade configuration of the school? (Examples: 6-8, 4-5)
What is the racial demographics of the school (list approximately %): white African American Hispanic Other
Poverty (list % considered below the poverty level)
Approximate number of students enrolled in the school
Approximate number of academic teachers?
Approximate number of elective or exploratory teachers?
Number of counselors?
Number of administrators?
Please check the approximate percentage of your faculty who have had: Specific university preparation (as in a degree/certification) for middle level teaching. □ Less than 25% □ 25-50% □ 51-75% □ 76-100% Training through in-service, conferences, workshops, etc. □ Less than 25% □ 25-50% □ 51-75% □ 76-100%
Our school has an advisory program? Yes No
How often do the advisory classes meet? Daily twice a week once a week < than once a week
Scheduling: Self-contained classrooms Daily periods uniform in length (not including lunch) 5 Period Day 6 Period Day 7 Period Day 8 Period Day Flexible scheduling within blocks of teams Flexible to the degree that all periods are scheduled but not identical in length. Flexible to the degree that change occurs within defined general time limits. Flexible to the degree that students and teachers control the daily time usage and changes occur regularly.
Teachers are organized into: check all that apply Interdisciplinary teams Content Area Teams Partial team arrangements (at one grade but not others) Other team arrangements Teachers do not work in teams.
Teacher planning periods: All have one planning period All teachers have two planning periods (one individual, one team) Most teachers have one planning period Most teachers have two planning periods (one individual, one team). Teachers do not have a planning period (not including lunch).

How often do interdisciplinary teams meet?

Daily

Twice a week

Weekly

Monthly

Less than once a month

Student grouping:

Please check the statement below that best describes how students are grouped within your teams or grade levels (homogeneous vs. heterogeneous) for instruction.

- "Ability" (homogeneous) grouping is carried out at all grade levels in all subject areas.
- "Ability" grouping is carried out at all grade levels, but restricted to certain subject areas.
- "Ability" grouping is carried out only at certain grade levels, but the grouping is done in all subject areas at those levels.
- "Ability" Grouping is carried out only at certain grade levels, and is restricted to certain subject areas at those grade levels. Grouping is random.

Deliberate care is made to assure that students are heterogeneously grouped in all areas (academic, race, gender, etc.).

Please estimate the percent of time students are involved in the following instructional activities.

 Direct instruction
 Less than 20%
 21-40%
 41-60%
 61-80%
 above 80%

 Cooperative learning
 Less than 20%
 21-40%
 41-60%
 61-80%
 above 80%

 Hands-on activities
 Less than 20%
 21-40%
 41-60%
 61-80%
 above 80%

 Role Play
 Less than 20%
 21-40%
 41-60%
 61-80%
 above 80%

Service learning (community service)

Less than 20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% above 80%

Interdisciplinary thematic instruction

Less than 20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% above 80%

How are students assessed? Check all that apply.

Portfolios

Project based assessments

Rubrics

Open-ended essay exams

Benchmark assessments

End of unit/chapter tests

Which of the following activities are available to students in your school? Check all that apply.

Integrated curriculum (math, science, social studies, ELA)

Competitive sports

Intramural sports

Clubs

Exploratory courses (specify)

Health classes

Tutorials

Counselors

Social skills training

Anger management

Peer Mediation

Care guidance

Student Government or Council

Elective courses (specify)_____

How are parents involved in your school? Please check all that apply.

Parent conferences

Online website and grades to check

Newsletters

Parent Teacher Organization

Volunteers

Parent Nights

Programs

Sports boosters

Site Council

Please indicate remedial arrangements available to students at your school. Check all that apply:

No special programs, it is up to the students to stay on grade level

Extra work or homework by classroom teacher

Special education - Co-Teaching/Inclusion

Special education - resource room/self-contained

Special education - Grand Central Station or Content Mastery

Extra subject level period instead of elective or exploratory course

After school or before-school classes or coaching sessions

Saturday Classes

Summer School